The Examiner has indicated that claims 21-28 are subject to election because the species contained therein are deemed to have a lack of unity "because they are not so linked as to form a single inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1".

PROVISIONAL ELECTION

Applicants provisionally elect the following "species" for search purposes only:

PDE5 inhibitor:

Sildenafil

Indication:

Sepsis associated encephalopathy

Claims 21-28 are readable on the provisionally elected species.

<u>TRAVERSAL</u>

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's institution of a requirement for election of species.

First, the election requirement is traversed because unity of invention exists between the chemical species presently claimed. Each chemical species are inhibitors of a very specific phosphodiesterase, namely PDE5. A complete and thorough search for the provisionally elected species set forth above would require searching the art areas appropriate to all other PDE5 inhibitors. Further, unity of invention exists between the specific disorders claimed in present claim 21. Each disorder falls under the scope of "impairment or dysfunction of cerebral vascular reactivity". Since a search of the subject matter of the provisionally elected species and all other subject matter contained in this application would be coextensive, it would not be a <u>serious</u> burden upon the Examiner to conduct a search of <u>all</u> subject matter contained in this application.

DUNKERN, et al. USSN 10/590,992

Furthermore, applicants have paid a filing fee for an examination of all the claims

in this application. If the Examiner refuses to examine the full scope of claims paid for

when filing this application and persists in requiring applicants to file divisional

applications for each of the groups of claims, the Examiner would essentially be forcing

applicants to pay duplicative fees for the non-elected or withdrawn claims, inasmuch as

the original filing fees for the claims (which would be later prosecuted in divisional

applications) are not refundable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to

reconsider and withdraw the election requirement, and to examine the full scope of the

claims pending in this application.

If the Examiner has any questions or wishes to discuss this matter, the Examiner

is welcomed to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

THE NATH LAW GROUP

Date: January 7, 2008

THE NATH LAW GROUP

112 South West Street

Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone: (703) 548-6284

Facsimile: (703) 683-8396

JBG/SMM\RRR.doc

Gary M. Nath Reg. No. 26,965

Joshua B. Goldberg

Reg. No. 44,126

Sheldon M. McGee

Reg. No. 50,454

Customer No. 34375

3